| • | The second secon |
|----|--|
| 1 | BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General |
| 2 | of the State of California |
| 3 | Senior Assistant Attorney General CHRISTINA V. TUSAN. (SBN 192203) SACRAMENTO COURTS |
| 4 | Deputy Attorney General 300 South Spring Street, Suite 5000 Los Angeles, California 90013 |
| 5 | Los Angeles, California 90013 |
| 6 | |
| 7 | RONALD A. REITER, (SBN 62497) Supervising Deputy Attorney General |
| 8 | Supervising Deputy Attorney General 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, California 94102 |
| 9 | |
| 10 | Attorneys for the People of the State of California |
| 12 | (Additional counsel for the Plaintiffs on following page) |
| 13 | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA |
| 14 | |
| 15 | 、 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO |
| 16 | PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA) 02A5 06109 |
| 17 | PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA) 0245 06109 AND KATHLEEN CONNELL, CONTROLLER OF THE STATE OF |
| 18 | CALIFORNIA, |
| 19 | FINAL JUDGMENT |
| 20 | Plaintiffs, |
| 21 | v. |
| 22 | STEWART TITLE COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.; STEWART TITLE GUARANTY COMPANY; AND STEWART INFORMATION SERVICES CORPORATION |
| 23 | GUARANTY COMPANY; AND STEWART) INFORMATION SERVICES CORPORATION) |
| 24 | Defendants. |
| 25 | |
| 26 | \cdot |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| - | FINAL JUDGMENT |

| 1 2 3 4 | District Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco DAVID A. PFEIFER (SBN 127785) JUNE D. GRAVETT (SBN 105094) Assistant District Attorneys 732 Brannan Street |
|------------------|---|
| 5 | |
| 6 | Attorneys for the People of the State of California |
| 7 | DENNIS HERRERA |
| 8 9 | City Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco JOANNE HOEPER (SBN 114961) |
| 10 | Chief Trial Attorney DONALD P. MARGOLIS (SBN 116588) |
| | 1390 Market Street, 6th Floor |
| 11 | San Francisco. California 94102-5408 |
| 12 | |
| 13 | Attorneys for the People of the State of California |
| 14 | KATHLEEN CONNELL, Controller |
| 15 | for the State of California RICHARD J. CHIVARO (SBN 124391) |
| 16 | Chief Counsel 300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1850 |
| 17 | Sacramento, California 95814 |
| 18 | |
| 19 | Attorneys for the California State Controller |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | • |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| | |
| 27 | ii |
| 28 | |
| | FINAL JUDGMENT |

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

22

23

24 25

26 27

28

Plaintiff, the People of the State of California ("the People"), appeared through the Attorney General, Bill Lockyer, by Deputy Attorneys General Ronald A. Reiter and Christina V. Tusan, through the District Attorney of San Francisco, Terence Hallinan, by Assistant District Attorney June Cravett, and through the City Attorney of San Francisco, Dennis Herrera, by Deputy City Attorney Donald P. Margolis. Plaintiff Kathleen Connell, Controller of the State of California appeared through Richard J. Chivaro, Chief Counsel. Defendants Stewart Title Company of California, Inc., Stewart Title Guaranty Company, and Stewart Information Services Corporation (collectively "Stewart") appeared through their attorneys Alborg, Veiluva and Cannata, by Thomas E. Alborg.

The Court having considered the Stipulation For Entry of Final Judgment executed by the parties and filed herewith, and good cause appearing,

IT IS HEREBY AGREED, ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT:

JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action and of the 1. parties. Venue as to all matters between the parties relating hereto lies in this Court.

INJUNCTION

The injunctive provisions of this judgment apply to Stewart; its directors, 2. officers, and shareholders; to the employees, representatives, agents, subsidiary and affiliated companies (regardless of the form of business organization), successors-in-interest, and assigns of Stewart; and any person or entity acting by, through, under, on behalf of, or in concert with Stewart or any other person or entity described in this paragraph, whether acting as a principal or agent, all of whom are referred to as "defendants." For the purpose of the injunctive provisions of this judgment, the term "agent" does not apply to non-subsidiary companies or entities in which Stewart does not have an ownership interest under the following circumstances: 1) those entities are preforming escrows services on their own behalf and 2) those entities are acting as Stewart's agent solely through their involvement in facilitating the provision of title insurance on behalf of Stewart.

3. For the purpose of this judgment, the term "financial benefit" means any consideration, other than consideration denominated as interest, that defendants obtain from a financial institution in connection with the defendants' deposit of escrow funds with that financial institution. "Financial benefit" includes a financial institution's absorption of expenses incident to providing normal banking functions or its forbearance from charging a fee in connection with providing normal banking functions or services, including those normal banking functions and services that the Federal Reserve Board determines may be provided without full charge consistent with 12 C.F.R. Part 217. Examples of "financial benefits" that may be provided by a financial institution include, but are not limited to, escrow accounting services and bank reconciliation, wire transfers, and loans at preferential interest rates.

4. Defendants, and each of them, are permanently enjoined and restrained from engaging in any of the following:

A. Billing or collecting from title insurance or escrow customers an amount that exceeds the actual cost to defendants of services provided by third parties in connection with defendants' performance of escrow and title services, such as overnight mail, courier, and notary services, unless (1) such practice is permitted by state and federal law and (2) defendants clearly and conspicuously disclose that the defendants have marked-up the third party charge.

B. Obtaining any financial benefit in connection with the deposit of escrow funds unless the full value of all financial benefits is (1) exclusively used to underwrite the cost of escrow services and (2) fully allocated to Stewart's escrow division. Stewart shall continually maintain, with a retention period of a minimum of three fiscal years, accounting information that clearly, accurately, and in sufficient detail demonstrates its compliance with this provision.

C. Assessing a separate charge to escrow or title customers for any service such as wire transfers, if the service is provided as a financial benefit or the cost of the

service is otherwise waived, credited, paid, or assumed by the provider of the service.

- D. Depositing escrow funds in any financial institution in which defendants have any ownership interest, management, or control if (1) the deposit of funds in that financial institution would breach Stewart's fiduciary duties as escrow agent or (2) that financial institution failed to provide financial benefits in connection with the deposit of escrow funds that were comparable to the best arrangement for the provision of financial benefits offered by California financial institutions in connection with the deposit of escrow funds.
- E. Demanding, charging, or collecting a separate fee from escrow or title insurance customers in connection with investigating or tracking whether a beneficiary under a deed of trust causes a deed of reconveyance to be recorded after the obligation owed to the beneficiary has been satisfied, except to the extent that a separate fee is affirmatively and explicitly authorized by a subsequent statute.
- F. Demanding, charging, or collecting a separate fee from escrow or title insurance customers in connection with preparing, issuing, or recording a release of obligation or providing notice of intention to do so, except to the extent that a separate fee is affirmatively and explicitly authorized by a subsequent statute.
- G. Collecting a separate fee for a deed of reconveyance (including any recording fee therefore) from an escrow or title insurance customer without separately accounting for this fee in a suspense account or otherwise segregating this fee from defendants' funds in accordance with generally acceptable accounting principles until the fee is transmitted to the trustee or beneficiary under the deed of trust, is returned to the customer, or is paid as required by law.
- H. Disbursing monies to financial institutions that are beneficiaries under deeds of trust at the close of escrow unless disbursed in the following manner:
- (1) By wire or electronic fund transfer upon close of escrow; by check sent upon close of escrow via a next day delivery service, such as Federal Express, for

delivery on the next business day following the close of escrow; or by hand delivery for delivery on the same day as, or on the next business day following, the close of escrow.

- it would be impracticable for the funds to be disbursed in the manner described in subparagraph H(1), the funds shall be disbursed on the next business day following the close of escrow by the most expeditious means available.
- (3) Notwithstanding subparagraphs H(1) and H(2), any means directed by the seller or refinancing owner in an escrow instruction signed or initialed by the seller or refinancing owner.
- (4) If the defendant acts as the escrow, any instruction described in subparagraph H(3) shall appear on a separate page with no other writing except that necessary to identify the escrow, the parties, the property, the date, the signature of the party giving the instruction, and the following notice which shall clearly and conspicuously appear immediately above or adjacent to the place reserved for the escrow customer's signature. "Any delay in sending funds to a beneficiary under a deed of trust could result in additional interest charges or other expense. You should compare the amount of interest charges or other expenses resulting from a delay in sending funds with the amount you will be charged for wire, electronic fund transfer, or overnight delivery before you sign or initial this escrow instruction."
- (5) When disbursing funds by wire or electronic transfer, Defendant shall utilize to the fullest extent practicable wire transfers (or similar electronic transfers) where such transfers are included in earned credits furnished by the depositing institution.

RESTITUTION

5. Stewart shall pay restitution in the total amount of two million two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$2,250,000) ("Restitution") in the form of cash payments, as provided in paragraphs 6 through 17, with the balance of the restitution remaining after cash payments paid as cy pres restitution to the Consumer Protection Prosecution Trust Fund, established

in <u>People v. ITT Consumer Financial Corporation, et al.</u>, Alameda Superior Court Case No. 656038-0, for the investigation and prosecution of cases involving consumer real estate, home mortgage, and consumer finance transactions, civil law enforcement or other consumer protection matters as the trustees of that trust fund in their discretion may direct. All administrative expenses associated with the payment of these funds shall be borne by Stewart and are in addition to Stewart's restitution obligation described in this paragraph.

Payments to Claimants

- 6. A. Within five days after the Attorney General has given Stewart notice that the verification process has been completed and the Attorney General has determined that the information provided was substantially complete and accurate, as more fully described in paragraphs 19-21 of this Judgment and paragraph 1F of the Stipulation, Stewart shall directly mail a check in the amount of sixty five dollars (\$65) to each of its former escrow customers who meet all of the following conditions:
- (1) Customer closed an escrow transaction for the purchase, sale or refinancing of residential property containing one- to four-dwelling units where Stewart acted as escrow agent or title insurer between May 19, 1995 and the date of the entry of judgment (hereafter referred to as "Customer").
- (2) (a) Customer was charged and paid a fee for the preparation or recording of a deed of reconveyance where Stewart did not perform the services charged for; or (b) Customer was charged and paid a fee for a release of obligation and Stewart did not prepare a release of obligation or (c) Stewart charged, and Customer paid, for preparing a release of obligation or recording a reconveyance where the performance of the service was unnecessary.
- (3) Where Stewart has charged a fee as described in paragraph 6(A)(2), there is a presumption that such fees were paid by Customer.
- 7. Stewart shall have no obligation to make payment under paragraph 6 of this Judgment if Stewart establishes that it transmitted the Customer's reconveyance fee to the

trustee or beneficiary under the deed of trust that encumbered the customer's property or escheated the fee charged the customer to the state.

- 8. Any payments not disbursed under paragraph 6 of this Judgment shall be subject to payment to each eligible Customer who submits a timely claim ("Claimant") as more fully discussed in paragraph 10 of this Judgment. For the purpose of this judgment, a claim shall be deemed eligible and the Claimant shall be entitled to payment under the following circumstances:
- A. Claimant closed an escrow transaction for the purchase, sale or refinancing of residential property containing one- to four-dwelling units where Stewart acted as escrow agent or title insurer between May 19, 1995 and the date of the entry of judgment.
- B. (1) Claimant deposited funds during his or her escrow transaction that may have been used by Stewart to obtain financial benefits from a lending institution; (2) the Claimant was charged for various miscellaneous services including messenger services, recording services, overnight delivery services, or wire transfer services or (3) Claimant paid for tracking service or paid a fee in connection with preparing, issuing, or recording a release of obligation or providing a notice of intent to do so.
- C. Claimants in the category described in paragraphs 8(B)(1) or 8(B)(2) of this Judgment who present a single claim under one of those categories shall be entitled to a minimum payment of twenty five (\$25) in cash, and a maximum cash payment of fifty dollars (\$50), depending on the number of claims and available settlement funds.
- D. Claimants with claims under both paragraphs 8(B)(1) and 8(B)(2) of this Judgment shall be entitled to a minimum payment of fifty dollars (\$50) in cash, and a maximum payment of one hundred dollars (\$100) depending on the number of claims and available settlement funds.
- E. Claimants with claims under 8(B)(3) shall be entitled to a payment of sixty-five dollars (S65) in cash. This payment shall be in addition to any amounts available

11

12

13 14

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22

2324

25

2627

28

under paragraphs 8(C) or 8(D) of this Judgment.

- 9. Stewart shall have no obligation to make payment under paragraph 8(B)(3) of this Judgment if Stewart establishes that it did any of the following:
- A. Transmitted the Claimant's reconveyance fee to the trustee or beneficiary under the deed of trust that encumbered the Customer's property.
- B. Prepared and recorded a deed of reconveyance while acting in the capacity of trustee under the deed of trust.
 - C. Escheated to the state the fee charged the Customer.
- Within five days after the Attorney General has given Stewart notice that the 10. verification process has been completed and that the Attorney General has determined that the information provided was substantially complete and accurate, as more fully described in paragraphs 19-21 of this Judgement and paragraph 1F of the Stipulation, Stewart, at its sole expense, shall cause to be published a notice, whose form and contents are satisfactory to the People, at least once per week for three consecutive weeks. The published notices will appear in the Los Angeles Times, the San Francisco Chronicle and Examiner, the Sacramento Bee, the Modesto Bee, the Fresno Bee, the San Diego Union Tribune, the Bakersfield Californian, the Orange County Register, the San Jose Mercury News, and the Oakland Tribune. The notice shall state that former escrow Customers who meet the criteria set forth in paragraph 8 are eligible to file a claim to recover a minimum of twenty-five dollars (\$25) and a maximum of one hundred sixty-five dollars (\$165) if the claim is returned by a date specified in the notice that is at least 90 days after the date on which the The notice shall indicate that the claim must indicate the first notice is published. Claimant's name and the address of the property involved in the escrow. The notice may request additional documentation if available to the Customer but shall clearly indicate that the Customer is not obliged to provide any further information to be eligible. The published notice shall state that no specific claim form is required as long as the Claimant's name and property address is set forth, but the notice shall set forth a sample form that may be

11

12

17 18

16

19 20

21 22

23

2425

2627

28

completed and returned. The notice shall also set forth the address to which the claim form is to be sent and a toll-free telephone number to which inquiries may be directed.

- 11. The claims shall be returned to a Settlement Administrator, as more particularly described in paragraph 19. The Settlement Administrator shall log the claims and transmit them to Stewart.
- After the close of the claims settlement period, the Settlement Administrator will transmit all claims to Stewart. After the completion of the verification process and a determination that the information provided by Stewart was substantially complete and accurate, as more fully described in paragraphs 19 through 21 of this Judgment and paragraph 1F of the Stipulation, Stewart shall (A) pay the claim without further review or (B) review the claim, conduct a diligent search of all relevant business records and public records, and determine the Claimant's eligibility for payment. If Stewart determines that the Claimant is eligible, Stewart shall pay the claim within 15 days. If Stewart determines that the Claimant is not eligible, Stewart shall provide the Settlement Administrator, within 15 days, with the name and address of each person who submitted the claim that Stewart determined was ineligible and a complete statement of reasons for the denial of that Claimant's claim including all of the documentation on which Stewart relies to establish Stewart's determination that the Claimant is not eligible for payment. The Settlement Administrator shall review the rejected claims, any written objections submitted as described under paragraph 13, and the records, including the escrow file, that may be relevant for determining the Claimant's eligibility. The Settlement Administrator shall report its evaluation of the merits of each rejected claim to the People. If the People dispute Stewart's rejection of a claim and the parties are unable to resolve the dispute, all disputed claims shall be submitted, at Stewart's sole expense, to an arbitrator selected by the parties or, in the event the parties do not agree on an arbitrator, to an arbitrator selected by the court.
- 13. Stewart shall also notify each person who submitted a claim that was rejected and briefly describe the reason for rejecting the claim. The notice shall indicate that if the

Claimant disputes the rejection of the claim, the Claimant may provide the Settlement Administrator with a written objection stating all of the Claimant's grounds for disputing the rejection of the claim. The notice shall indicate that the written objection must be mailed to the Settlement Administrator at an address set forth in the notice and must be submitted by a specified date, which shall not be less than 15 days following the date of the mailing of the notice.

- 14. Stewart shall pay the sums set forth in paragraph 6 for all undisputed claims and all disputed claims that an arbitrator determines are owed as discussed in paragraph 12. The amount of payments under paragraph 8 shall be prorated based on remaining available settlement funds, but shall in no event exceed the maximum amounts payable under paragraph 8 or fall below the minimum amounts payable under paragraph 8. Under no circumstances shall Stewart be obligated to make restitution to Claimants of a sum in excess of the total Restitution amount set forth in paragraph 5.
- 15. The Settlement Administrator shall respond to any questions by the public about the claims procedure and, in connection therewith, shall establish a toll free number.
- 16. The envelopes containing the checks sent by Stewart to Claimants shall be marked with the Settlement Administrator's return address. If any check sent to a Claimant is returned undeliverable, the Settlement Administrator shall take or cause to be taken reasonable steps, including skip-tracing if reasonable, to attempt to locate the Claimant. If thereafter the Claimant is still not located or if the Claimant's check is not cashed within six months, any funds payable under the judgment shall be promptly, but in no event later than October 1, 2002, paid as cy pres restitution as provided in paragraph 5.
- 17. Within 90 days following the closure of the cash claims period, Stewart shall provide the People and the Settlement Administrator with a report indicating the name and address of each Claimant paid, the date of payment, and the amount of the claim. If any claims are thereafter paid, Stewart shall supplement the report with additional quarterly reports indicating the name and address of each Claimant paid, the date of payment, and the

amount paid. Within seven months of the date of issuing checks in payment of claims, Stewart shall provide the People and the Settlement Administrator with a report of the names and addresses of Claimants whose checks are not cashed within six months of issuance. The reports required herein shall be subscribed under oath by an officer of Stewart indicating his or her firsthand personal knowledge of the facts set forth in the report.

CASH PAYMENT

18. In addition to the Restitution amount provided in paragraph 5, Stewart is ordered to pay the People the sum of two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000) in the form of a wire transfer to the Office of the Attorney General. Upon the completion of the verification procedure described in paragraphs 19 through 21 of the Judgment and a determination that the information provided by Stewart was substantially complete and accurate as more fully described in paragraph 1F of the Stipulation, the Attorney General shall distribute one hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000) as provided under Business and Professions Code section 17206, 17536 and Government Code section 26506 with one-half of those funds distributed to the Attorney General, one-fourth of those funds distributed to the District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, and one-fourth of the funds distributed to the City Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco; one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) among counsel for the People as reimbursement of attorney's fees and costs, including attorney's fees and costs for the monitoring of Stewart's compliance with the judgment.

<u>VERIFICATION</u>

19. Stewart and counsel for the People jointly shall select, and Stewart shall retain at its sole expense, a third party settlement administrator ("Settlement Administrator") and a third party verifier ("Verifier"). The Settlement Administrator shall be an independent firm that is substantially experienced in the administration of consumer payment programs. The Verifier shall be an independent firm containing one or more certified public accountants experienced in verification and examination

6

12

13

10

16 17

18

19

2021

22 | 23 |

24

25

2627

28

procedures. The Verifier shall have responsibility for the following:

- A. The Verifier shall verify that information provided to the People by Stewart was substantially complete and accurate at the time the information was presented. The verification procedure may include a reasonable examination and testing of Stewart's records and interviews of Stewart's personnel.
- B. The procedures to be employed by the Verifier to determine compliance and payment shall be developed by the Verifier consistent with applicable standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and shall include testing and such other procedures sufficient to enable the Verifier to render an opinion concerning the defendants' assertion of compliance relied on by the People as a basis for settlement.
- The Verifier shall provide Stewart and counsel for the People with a C. final report no later than March 1, 2002, unless Stewart and counsel for the People agree to a later date, which agreement shall not be unreasonably withheld if additional time is needed to prepare an appropriate report. The final report shall be issued promptly upon completion of all action required hereunder. The final report shall (1) summarize all tasks undertaken by the Verifier, (2) set forth the Verifier's opinion that defendants have furnished substantially accurate and complete information to counsel for the People, and (3) set forth the Verifier's certification of its compliance with the procedures set forth in this Judgment except to the extent of any specifically described deficiencies in compliance. The final report shall be provided to the Attorney General of California, Consumer Law Section, 300 S. Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90013, Attention: Deputy Attorney General Christina Tusan; to the San Francisco District Attorney, Consumer and Environmental Protection Unit. 732 Brannan Street, San Francisco, California, Attention: June Cravett; and to the City Attorney of San Francisco, 1390 Market Street, 6th Floor, San Francisco, California 94102-5408, Attention: Donald P. Margolis (and/or to such other address or to the attention of such other person as the offices of the Attorney

General, District Attorney of San Francisco, or City Attorney of San Francisco shall specify in writing to Stewart and the Verifier).

- D. The letter of engagement entered into between Stewart and the Verifier shall provide the following: (1) a description of the Verifier's duties as provided in this Judgment, (2) a requirement that the Verifier shall make available to Stewart and counsel for the People, within 30 days of written request, copies of all records, documents, reports and work papers obtained or prepared in connection with the duties set forth herein, and (3) a requirement that the Verifier make available to Stewart and counsel for the People a person or persons familiar with the procedures to be performed as required by this Judgment or provided in the letter of engagement. If Stewart has already produced documents responsive to the request, the Verifier may identify those documents in lieu of providing duplicates. The letter of engagement shall acknowledge that the Attorney General, the District Attorney of San Francisco, and the City Attorney of San Francisco are each an intended user or beneficiary of the report.
- 20. To facilitate the Verifier's responsibilities, Stewart shall make available, at Stewart's expense, to the Verifier sufficient documents, persons, and other information, including data bases, to enable the Verifier to fulfill its functions under this Judgment, including documents, access to persons, and information reasonably related to the determination of whether Stewart furnished substantially accurate and complete information to counsel for the People.
- General, the District Attorney of San Francisco, and/or the City Attorney of San Francisco, within 30 days of a written request, all records, documents and personnel reasonably necessary to ascertain Stewart's and the Verifier's compliance with this Judgment. Nothing herein limits the right of the Attorney General, the District Attorney of San Francisco, or the City Attorney of San Francisco to request or obtain information from defendants as otherwise provided in this Judgment or as provided by law.

SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

- 22. The Settlement Administrator shall carry out its duties as described in the "Payments to Claimants" portion of this judgment, as set forth in paragraphs 6 through 16, and shall verify that Stewart has processed claims, properly rejected those claims Stewart determined to be ineligible, and actually paid Claimants with eligible claims as provided under paragraphs 6 through 17.
- the People with a final report no later than July 1, 2002, unless Stewart and counsel for the People agree to a later date, which agreement shall not be unreasonably withheld if additional time is needed to prepare an appropriate report. The final report shall be issued promptly upon completion of all action required hereunder. The final report shall (1) set forth the Settlement Administrator's opinion that Stewart has paid cash claims to Claimants as provided under paragraphs 6 through 17 of this Judgment, and (2) set forth the Settlement Administrator's certification of its compliance with the procedures set forth in this Judgment except to the extent of any specifically described deficiencies in compliance.
- Administrator shall provide the following: (1) a description of the Settlement
 Administrator's duties as provided in this Judgment, (2) a requirement that the Settlement
 Administrator shall make available to Stewart and counsel for the People, within 30 days
 of written request, copies of all records, documents, reports and work papers obtained or
 prepared in connection with the duties set forth herein, and (3) a requirement that the
 Settlement Administrator make available to Stewart and counsel for the People a person
 or persons familiar with the procedures to be performed as required by this Judgment or
 provided in the letter of engagement. If Stewart has already produced documents
 responsive to the request, the Settlement Administrator may identify those documents in
 lieu of providing duplicates. The letter of engagement shall acknowledge that the

Attorney General, the District Attorney of San Francisco, and the City Attorney of San Francisco are each an intended user or beneficiary of the report.

- 25. To facilitate the Settlement Administrator's responsibilities, Stewart shall make available, at Stewart's expense, to the Settlement Administrator, sufficient documents, persons, and other information, including data bases, to enable the Settlement Administrator to fulfill its functions under this Judgment, including documents, access to persons, and information reasonably related to the determination of whether Stewart furnished (A) substantially accurate and complete information to counsel for the People regarding payment of claims, (B) properly determined Claimants' eligibility for payment under paragraphs 6 through 17 of this Judgment, and (C) timely paid eligible cash Claimants.
- 26. A. On or before July 1, 2002, Stewart and the Settlement Administrator shall provide, to the extent applicable to each, to the Attorney General of California, Consumer Law Section, 300 S. Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90013, Attention: Deputy Attorney General Christina Tusan; to the San Francisco District Attorney, Consumer and Environmental Protection Unit, 732 Brannan Street, San Francisco, California, Attention: June Cravett; and to the City Attorney of San Francisco, 1390 Market Street, 6th Floor, San Francisco, California 94102-5408, Attention: Donald P. Margolis (and/or to such other address or to the attention of such other person as the offices of the Attorney General, District Attorney of San Francisco, or City Attorney of San Francisco shall specify in writing to Stewart and the Settlement Administrator), a Final Certification Report containing the following information:
- (1) A certification by Stewart that all monetary relief provided for herein due to all eligible Claimants has been paid. The report shall also certify compliance by Stewart and the Settlement Administrator with each provision of this Judgment related to such monetary relief to the extent applicable to each.
 - (2) An alphabetical list of the name and address of every eligible

cash Claimant to whom payment was made and a list of the name and address of every person who filed a claim that was determined to be ineligible for payment together with a brief description of the basis for concluding that the Claimant was ineligible.

B. Stewart and the Settlement Administrator shall provide for review by the Attorney General, the District Attorney of San Francisco, and/or the City Attorney of San Francisco, within 30 days of a written request, all records, documents and personnel reasonably necessary to ascertain Stewart's and the Settlement Administrator's compliance with this Judgment as to Claimants (for example, in response to inquiries concerning specific Claimants). Nothing herein limits the right of the Attorney General, the District Attorney of San Francisco, or the City Attorney of San Francisco to request or obtain information from defendants as otherwise provided in this Judgment or as provided by law.

RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

27. This Court shall retain jurisdiction over this matter for the purpose of enabling any of the parties to apply to the Court at any time for such further orders or directives as may be necessary or appropriate for the modification of the injunctive provisions herein or for the interpretation or enforcement of any of the provisions of this Judgment.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17203

28. All injunctive and other equitable relief under this Judgment, including all relief described in paragraphs 5 through 17 inclusive, is ordered pursuant to the court's equitable powers, including those remedial powers authorized by Business and Professions Code section 17203.

PAYMENT OF COURT COSTS

29. Stewart shall pay all court costs associated with its appearance in this action, including any fee for the filing of the stipulation for entry of judgment. Except as otherwise provided herein, each party shall bear its own costs, including attorneys' fees.

This Judgment shall be binding and effective when entered by the Court.

30.

Judgment, including the payment provisions, is a fair, equitable, and final resolution and disposition of all and only those matters pleaded in the Complaint to constitute violations of Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq. and 17500 during the period from May 19, 1995 until the date of entry of this judgment, and those matters pleaded to constitute violations of Code of Civil Procedure section 1500 et seq. for unclaimed property up through December 31, 1998 (other than claims for interest pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1577). As the parties have further stipulated and the court adjudges, the Stipulation for Entry of Final Judgment and this Judgment do not settle, compromise, bar, or otherwise in any manner affect any and all claims for interest pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1577 for monies escheated to the State Controller's Office without limitation on time period, which the State Controller may pursue notwithstanding the Stipulation for Entry of Final Judgment or the entry of this Judgment.

DATED: 0CT - 8 2002

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

LOREN E. McMASTER